



Chesapeake Bay Program
Science. Restoration. Partnership.

Agriculture Workgroup

February 2025



Opening Remarks & Membership Update



AgWG 2025-26 at-large members

Name	Affiliation	Membership Category	Alternate (If specified)
Jim Riddell	Virginia Cattlemen's Association	Agribusiness & Industry	Brandon Reeves (Virginia Cattlemen's Association)
Emily Dekar	Upper Susquehanna Coalition	Soil/Water Conservation	
Paul Bredwell	U.S. Poultry and Egg Association	Agribusiness & Industry	Christian Richter (U.S. Poultry and Egg Association)
Matt Royer	Penn State University	Academic/Extension	Tyler Groh (Penn State University)
RO Britt	Smithfield Foods	Agribusiness & Industry	Dylan Carden (Smithfield Foods)
Nick Hepfl	Herbert, Rowland, and Grubic Inc.	Agribusiness & Industry	

Agenda

1 Planning Recap

4

**Next Steps/
Closing Remarks**

2

**Implementation in the
Jurisdictions**

3

**Ag Perspectives in the
AgWG**



1

Planning Recap



What we've done so far

- We fill our agendas, but our workgroup is lacking clear direction
- Prudent to establish focus as Beyond 2025, Ag Advisory Committee take shape
- Took the following path to get to this point:

October	November	December	January	February
What is the purpose and role of the AgWG moving forward?				
Brainstorm areas of interest, future deliverables	CESR Report	Beyond 2025	Agriculture Advisory Cmte and other CBP entities	Prioritization of interests, focus areas, at in-person meeting
What would you like to see the AgWG accomplish in the next two years?	How should findings presented in the CESR report influence the direction of the AgWG?	How might Beyond 2025 influence the direction of the AgWG?	How do we engage with the AAC, STAC, other workgroups, to best support our purpose and goals?	

“Where are we?”

- Why does the AgWG exist?
 - Community of practice
 - Support partnership in achieving Clean Water Goal, 2025 WIP Outcome (ag sector)
- Before we look ahead, need to understand the progress we’ve made toward our “goal”
 - Have BMPs in place to reduce 100% of N, P, S loads needed to attain water quality standards as described in TMDL
 - WIPs are roadmaps for achieving required pollution reductions
 - How close are we? What has been done already, and what is still to come?

		Progress toward 2025 WIP (w/ Climate)		
Jurisdiction	Source	N	P	S
DE	Agriculture	10%	25%	62%
	All	9%	39%	64%
DC	Agriculture	N/A	N/A	N/A
MD	Agriculture	45%	38%	46%
	All	83%	100%	100%
NY	Agriculture	71%	65%	69%
	All	65%	66%	26%
PA	Agriculture	22%	27%	60%
	All	29%	50%	58%
VA	Agriculture	34%	42%	61%
	All	80%	62%	100%
WV	Agriculture	0%	21%	44%
	All	100%	91%	100%

Source: [2025 WIP Outcome page, Chesapeake Progress](#)

- Scroll to charts below progress section, click data download button
- Spreadsheet "Data_2023_MLR_Source_Sector_Chart_August2024"; tab "State Sector Chart"

Focus: successes and challenges

- What do the jurisdictions' roadmaps for achieving planning targets outline?
 - Which programs have been implemented? Which have been most effective?
 - Which efforts have faced challenges? What is the nature of those challenges?
- What do we, as a group, want to spotlight, amplify, replicate?
- Where can we, as a group, help reduce/eliminate obstacles?

Implementation in the Jurisdictions

Panel

● Questions:

1. Which projects, programs, and initiatives that support the reduction of ag nonpoint-source pollution have been most successful in your jurisdiction? What has contributed to their success?
2. Describe the challenges that your jurisdiction faces as you continue to advance toward your ag-related 2025 WIP targets.

Discussion

● Questions:

1. What are the common themes through the jurisdictions' successes? Which challenges are shared?
2. What are the ways in which the AgWG can work across the jurisdictions to address the challenges that were shared?

Ag Perspectives in the AgWG

Panel

● Questions:

1. In what ways has the AgWG done well in incorporating ag stakeholder perspectives in our discussions? In what contexts has this perspective been missing and what do you feel is most critical for us to hear from our ag stakeholders?
2. What actions can we take to better incorporate ag perspectives into the AgWG's efforts to achieve Bay water quality targets?

Discussion

● Questions:

1. How might the AgWG better serve as a place for sharing ag stakeholder perspectives?
2. What does the group (meeting participants) think would be most valuable to hear from ag stakeholders?

Next Steps & Closing Remarks

Recap

- Takeaways from the panels to discuss further?

What next?

- Summary all of the ideas we've heard
- Three thematic areas:
 - Implementation & Lessons from the Field
 - Targeting implementation
 - New strategies for getting practices on the ground
 - Crediting & Verification
 - Alternative verification methods (remote sensing)
 - Address key verification challenges
 - Establish adequate crediting for implemented practices (definitions, duration)
 - Add to suite of BMPs receiving credit (EPEG/EP, NRCS practices)
 - Innovation & Emerging Opportunities
 - Pay-for-performance
 - Monitoring
 - Mass balance
 - Sustainable ag, co-benefits

What next?

- Determine where we feel we can best make headway
 - Identify topics of interest to AgWG members
 - List goals falling within the scope of those topics
 - Strategize how we can collectively build knowledge, expertise, discussions, and decisions to support those goals
- Have plan in place this spring to guide agenda development for remaining meetings this year and 2026

Anything else?

- Send to Caroline Kleis (Kleis.Caroline@epa.gov) for inclusion in “Recap” email

Thank you!

Any questions?

You can contact me at Hughes.Eric@epa.gov



Chesapeake Bay Program

Science. Restoration. Partnership.